

Notes on meeting with W&PBC planners 20th October 04

Present Simon Williams / Debby Redding / Martin Gallivan / David Emery / T Bugler / J Allen / John Sutherland

Object – Continuation of meeting of 5 July 04 with Richard Burgess and Debby Redding - to ensure that W&PBC were aware of the continued interest of the SPS in the protection of SP – and to ascertain the policy towards the village of W&PBC – to maintain an amicable dialogue with the W&PBC.

SW began by talking of the old Weymouth Town Map, which included Sutton Poyntz very much as it is today. This matured into the Local Plan of 1987 and subsequently into the revised plan, which was reviewed by the Inspector in August. Throughout all these plans area affecting Sutton Poyntz have remained virtually unchanged with the Development Area remaining as a tight encapsulation of the current development. Pressure to include land for development has been resisted - the AONB to the west (to Chalbury Hill) and the green wedge have been totally resisted. The conservation area has been increased.

The Local Plan is due to be replaced by the Local Development Framework.

Planning has to keep within the national policy –

- Keep within existing development boundaries.

- Use windfall sites to contribute to local building targets – ie areas not specifically identified within the Local plan for development.

- Protect greenfield sites – (ie use brownfield sites in preference!!)

He had prepared some marked up plans of the area showing all planning applications over the last 5 years. He discussed the significant applications including Verlands / Verlands backfill (noting that backfill is no longer a decried development – highlighted development adjacent to the Spa which was approved on appeal) / Mission Hall Lane (N) which was rejected / Corner Cottage / Mission Hall Lane (S) / Sutton Road currently being built.

In discussing the volume of traffic that could be supported by Mission Hall Lane – MG suggested that today's guidelines could suggest that the existing lane size could support up to 30 dwellings - !!

On specific questions, SW indicated that the work at Little Orchard was permitted without further planning approval and the Springhead signage scheme is currently in the Appeal process.

Unfortunately, the appeal process can currently take up to a year. A copy of the rejected appeal for Brookmead was passed to us.

SW left further copies of the Booklet on Planning Considerations and stressed that it is important that only material factors are addressed in planning objections.

There was some discussion on ways forward from our Village plan – suggestions included an appraisal plan – conservation plan – etc. An item to follow up was a suggestion of possible contact with Bournemouth University who run a Heritage Conservation Course – for possible mutual assistance; there is much material available from the SPS and from the W&PBC. **(SW to provide a contact.)** It was suggested that the countryside agencies might be the source of example Appraisals. It was suggested that an area missing from our Village Survey was an action plan.

Problems of parking around the pond were discussed. MG suggested that restricted parking would need yellow lines – there was a possibility of a residents parking scheme, but there would still be a need for visitors parking as well. It was suggested that we could approach WW re possible parking for visitors within the Waterworks. It was suggested that funding for parking provision could be available from the Environment Fund. There was some concern with lack of access for Fire engine – emergency vehicle access problems would move any possible solutions up the priority list! There was no offer to provide any signage at present.

SW advised that the Preston Brook flood relief scheme was to be implemented soon, following which they would be looking at the River Jordan Valley. Responsibility for these small waterways was to be taken over soon by the Environment Agency.